REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to submission of certain aspects of earlier submitted Information Disclosure Statements, objected to claim 29, rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 21-24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 32-36 under the judicially created Doctrine of Double Patenting, rejected claims 39-47 as being indefinite, and rejected claims 1, 3, 5 and 39-47 under 35 USC 103(a). These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 22, 29, 35, 39, 42-45, 50, 51 and 64 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, claims 1, 3, 5, 40, 41, 46 and 47 have been cancelled, and new claims 63-74 have been added to the Application. Thus, claims 21-24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32-39, 42-45 and 48-74 are currently pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner purports to not consider U.S. Patents 5,632,037; 5,189,314; and 5,625,826 for failure to provide complete copies with earlier filed Information Disclosure Statements. To facilitate the Examiner's consideration of these references, Applicant submits, together herewith, a Supplemental Information Statement together with an accompanying PTO Form 1449 listing these references, as well as with complete copies of these references. Accordingly, the Examiner's consideration of these references is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 29 as being dependent from a canceled claim. Claim 29 has been amended to depend from claim 21. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 29.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 21-24, 26, 27, 29, 30 and 32-62 under the judicially created Doctrine of Double Patenting in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,752,001. To expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants submit together herewith a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the judicially created Doctrine of Double Patenting. In doing so,

Applicants do not admit, acquiesce, or otherwise agree to the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdrawal the rejection under the judicially created Doctrine of Double Patenting.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 39-47 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Namely, the Examiner indicated that lines 7-8 of claim 39 were vague and indefinite. Claim 39 has been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 39 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5 and 39-47 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenny et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,287,292. To expedite prosecution of this application, claims 1, 3 and 5 have been canceled and claims 39, 43, 44 and 45 have been placed in independent form. Claim 39 also substantially includes the limitations formerly in claim 47. Claim 39 pertains to a computer system that includes a processor module that supports a normal clock mode and a plurality of reduced power modes, and a temperature sensor. The frequency of the clock signal for the processor module is reduced to a value associated with one of the reduced power modes to avert overheating. In contrast, Kenny et al. does not teach or suggest reducing the frequency of the clock signal for a processor module to a value associated with one of the reduced power modes so as to avert overheating of the processor module. Claims 43, 44 and 45 pertain to a computer system having at least a processor module, an activity detector, and a temperature sensor, wherein the clock frequency (or clock mode) for the processor module is controlled based on the temperature and the activity of the processor module. In contrast, Kenny et al. mentions only heat monitoring. Kenny et al., however, does not monitor activity of an integrated circuit (e.g., CPU). Although col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 36, mentions that the temperature can be indirectly measured by monitoring activity to generate a temperature count, such is for the purpose of estimating the temperature of the integrated circuit, and thus is not monitoring activity of the integrated circuit. The temperature

count is obtained by counting up when the fast CPU clock is in use and counts down when the slow CPU clock is in use. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 39 and 42-46 are patentably distinct from Kenny et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdrawal the rejection under 35 USC 103(a).

Respectfully submitted,

C. Douglass Thomas
Reg. No. 32,947

Tel. (650) 493-2100